

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on July 11, 2008.

Claims 1-6, 8-12, 14, 15, 17, and 19 are pending. Claims 1, 8, 10 and 15 are amended, claims 7 and 18 are canceled. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-6, 15, 17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by art of record, Valenci (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0185220 A1). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As amended, claim 1 recites: An apparatus, comprising: a configuration module to store configuration information including instructions to reconfigure one or more hardware elements; and a hardware-based parsing module to connect to said configuration module, ***said parsing module comprising a microcode sequencer***, said parsing module to receive a frame of information and determine a frame format associated with said frame, retrieve configuration information corresponding to said frame format, and ***reconfigure a set of hardware elements to parse said frame based on*** the retrieved configuration information ***and microcode information from said microcode sequencer***.

Valenci fails to teach each and every element of the claims. Specifically, Valenci fails to teach at least two elements of independent claims 1 and 15.

First, Valenci fails to teach a parsing module comprising a microcode sequencer. Instead, Valenci teaches a parsing module that uses a table of parsing rules. In fact, Valenci teaches away from using microcode. Valenci, paragraph 0031. Therefore Valenci fails to teach this element of claims 1 and 15.

Second, Valenci fails to teach the parsing module to configure a set of hardware elements to parse a frame based on microcode information from the microcode sequencer. The Action asserts that Valenci teaches hardware reconfiguration, based on the statement that the network hardware may split the data from the headers for the packet (Valenci, paragraph 0036.) In fact, Valenci makes **no** mention at any point of a set of hardware elements being configured based on configuration information and microcode information. What Valenci describes is a way to

reconfigure a parser with software, using the rules in the rules table. A state machine is loaded into memory as parsing rules. Valenci paragraph 0035. The memory layout may then dictate where the split should take place, i.e. how to parse the packet. Valenci, paragraph 0036. At no point does Valenci state that a hardware element is reconfigured. Therefore, Valenci fails to teach this element of claims 1 and 15.

Because Valenci fails to teach at least two elements of claims 1 and 15, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are not anticipated by Valenci, and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Further, claims 2-6, and 17 and 19 depend from claims 1 and 15, and are allowable at least for being dependent on an allowable claim.

Claims 1-2, 7-9, 15 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sarkinen (U.S. 6,904,057 B2). Claim 18 is canceled. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the remaining claims.

Sarkinen fails to teach each and every element of the claims. Specifically, Sarkinen fails to teach at least one element of independent claims 1 and 15.

In particular, Sarkinen fails to teach the parsing module to configure a set of hardware elements to parse a frame based on microcode information from the microcode sequencer. The Action asserts that Sarkinen teaches configuring a set of hardware elements because the parsing engine of Sarkinen is programmable. However, Sarkinen does not disclose or suggest at any point that **hardware** elements are configured to parse a frame. Sarkinen appears to be a software-based parser, which is specifically taught away from by the present specification (See, e.g., Specification, paragraph 0029). The Action asserts that “hardware elements within 410 and 440 in Fig. 4 must be reconfigured in order to provide multi-stage parsing,” without any support from the specification that any such reconfiguration is taking place. Instead, Sarkinen does specifically mention that, for example, instruction memory generates instructions for the parsing engine (Sarkinen, col. 12, lines 55-56). Generating instructions is not the same as configuring a hardware element. Therefore, Sarkinen fails to teach at least this element of claims 1 and 15. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Further, claims 2, and 7-9 depend from claim 1, and are allowable at least for being dependent on an allowable claim.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 10 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over an art of record, Korpela (E.P. 0852448 A1) in view of Sarkinen (U.S. 6,904,057 B2).

The Action states that Korpela fails to teach a reconfigurable hardware-based frame parser as claimed, and relies on Sarkinen to overcome the deficiencies of Korpela. Claim 10 is amended to recite similar elements as those recited in claims 1 and 15. As discussed above, Sarkinen fails to teach the elements for which it is relied on. Therefore, the combination of Sarkinen and Korpela fails to teach or fairly suggest all of the elements of claim 10. The Action has not, therefore, presented a prima facie case of obviousness, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 14 depends from claim 10 and is allowable at least for being dependent from an allowable claim.

Claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over an art of record, Korpela (E.P. 0852448 A1) in view of Sarkinen (U.S. 6,904,057 B2), and further in view of Johnson (U.S. 7,184,722 B1).

Claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 10 and are allowable at least for being dependent from an allowable claim.

Applicant does not otherwise concede, however, the correctness of the Office Action's rejection with respect to any of the dependent claims discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant hereby reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary to further distinguish the dependent claims from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, based on additional features contained in the dependent claims that were not discussed above. A detailed discussion of these differences is believed to be unnecessary at this time in view of the basic differences in the independent claims pointed out above.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (724-933-9338) to facilitate prosecution of this application. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to deposit account 50-4238.

Respectfully submitted,

KACVINSKY LLC

Customer Number: 57035
724-933-5529

Date November 12, 2008

By /John F. Kacvinsky/

John F. Kacvinsky
Reg. No. 40,040